

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-21 were previously pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 18. As a result of this amendment, claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-21 are pending for examination with claims 1, 11, and 18 being independent. No new matter has been added.

I. Summary of the Telephone Interview with Examiner El Chanti

Applicants' representatives thank Examiner El Chanti for his courtesy in granting and conducting a telephone interview held on January 17, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed with the Examiner the rejections of claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-21. Applicants' representatives suggested that claims 1, 11, and 18 be amended. The Examiner indicated that claims 1, 11, and 18, as amended, should be in allowable condition. The Examiner reserved the right to conduct, if necessary, further search for relevant art.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Coile et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,598,081 (hereinafter Coile). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Notwithstanding Applicants' traversal, independent claims 1, 11, and 18 have been amended in a manner proposed during the January 17th interview to advance the prosecution of the application.

Support for the amendments may be found, e.g., on page 16, lines 31-34 of the application.

a. Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner proposed during the January 17th interview. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the claim, as amended, appears to distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of increasing throughput of a server capable of servicing at least one TCP/IP connection with a client, the server creating a TCP/IP Transmission Control Block (TCB) stored in non-paged pool (NPP) memory containing information required to identify and to service the client connection, comprising: *closing* a TCP/IP connection; *excluding information from the TCB not required to identify the client connection to form a timed-wait state TCB (TWTCB) for a time-wait period*; and releasing the NPP memory containing the information required to *service the client connection*; wherein *excluding information includes excluding a connection state information, send and receive queue information, a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection* (emphasis added).

As discussed during the interview, Coile neither discloses nor suggests “excluding information from the TCB not required to identify the client connection to form a timed-wait state TCB (TWTCB) for a time-wait period,” as recited in claim 1.

In Coile, the cut-through proxy needs to maintain a single connection object to keep track of *state information* for the connection between the client and the server (col. 8, lines 62-65) (Emphasis added). The cut-through proxy may also be referred to as the stateful inspection path because the packets are inspected and the state of the connection is maintained in the connection object (col. 8, lines 65-67 – col. 9, lines 1-2). Moreover, when a connection object 930 is defined, information from the client TCB block and the server TCB block is combined to form the connection object which contains all the necessary information for the nonparticipating application to alter IP packet headers and relay packets between the client and the server (col. 16, lines 52-57). The connection object includes the client and server IP addresses and port numbers and thus *identifies the unproxied connection* (col. 13, lines 53-55) (emphasis added).

Therefore, as discussed during the interview, Coile does not disclose or suggest that the connection object is formed by “excluding information from the TCB not required to identify the client connection to form a timed-wait state TCB (TWTCB) for a time-wait period,” as recited in claim 1, wherein “excluding information includes excluding a connection state information, send and receive queue information, a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection, ” as also recited in claim 1.

On page 16, lines 31-34 of the application, it is stated that “In this embodiment, the TWTCB eliminates the connection state information, send and receive queue information, the routing disconnect indication, the routing information for the connection, etc., that is typically included in the TCB to allow servicing thereof, but that it not needed to merely identify the connection.” Therefore, the information included in the TCB to allow servicing thereof and eliminated from the TWTCB is known in the art.

In addition, Coile does not teach or suggest “excluding information from the TCB not required to identify the client connection,” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Coile does not teach or suggest “releasing the NPP memory containing the information required to service the client connection,” as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Coile.

Claims 2-4 and 7-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-10 is respectfully requested.

b. Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended in a manner proposed during the January 17th interview. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the claim, as amended, appears to distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 11, as amended, recites a method for increasing the throughput of a server capable of servicing at least one TCP/IP connection, the server establishing a TCP/IP Transmission Control Block (TCB) of a size and containing information sufficient to identify and service the connection, comprising: closing the at least one TCP/IP connection; *forming a Timed-Wait TCB (TWTCB)* of a size less than the TCB; and releasing the TCB for use by the server; wherein forming the TWTCB includes *excluding a connection state information, send and receive queue information, a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection* (emphasis added).

As discussed above, Coile neither discloses nor suggests “forming a Timed-Wait TCB (TWTCB),” as recited in claim 11. Further, as discussed during the interview, Coile neither discloses nor suggests “excluding connection state information, send and receive queue information,

a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection,” as recited in claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Coile.

Claims 12-14 and 17 depend from claim 11 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-14 and 17 is respectfully requested.

c. Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 has been amended in a manner proposed during the January 17th interview. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the claim, as amended, appears to distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 18, as amended, recites a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps, comprising: closing a TCP/IP connection; *copying less than all information stored in a TCP/IP Transmission Control Block (TCB) into a Timed-Wait TCB (TWTCB); and maintaining the TWTCB for a timed wait period* to avoid late routed packets from establishing a new connection with a server; wherein *copying less than all information includes excluding a connection state information, send and receive queue information, a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection* (emphasis added).

As discussed above, Coile neither discloses nor suggests “copying less than all information stored in a TCP/IP Transmission Control Block (TCB) into a Timed-Wait TCB (TWTCB); and maintaining the TWTCB for a timed wait period,” as recited in claim 18. Further, as discussed during the interview, Coile neither discloses nor suggests “wherein copying less than all information includes excluding connection state information, send and receive queue information, a routing disconnect indication, and a routing information for the connection,” as recited in claim 18.

In view of the foregoing, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Coile.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-21 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James H. Morris, Reg. No.: 34,681
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

Dated: February 28, 2007
x02/28/2007x